



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,697	12/02/2003	Yung-Hsiang Hsu		1991
7590	12/29/2005		EXAMINER	
Troxell Law Office PLLC 5205 Leesburg Pike Suite 1404 Falls Church, VA 22041			RAABE, CHRISTOPHER M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				2879

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/724,697	HSU, YUNG-HSIANG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Christopher M. Raabe	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 6-10 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 6-10 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Amendment filed October 13, 2005 has been entered and acknowledged by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horowitz (USPN 2002/0097586), in view of Ishinaga (USPN 6753653).

With regard to claim 6,

Horowitz discloses a light bulb comprising: a base (paragraph 19, and 104,102,106 of fig 1); a light emitting device having: a circuit board (122 of fig 1); a light emitting repository located on a center of the circuit board and having a plurality of light sources (120,110 of fig 1); and a plurality of pins connecting the circuit board to the base (170 of fig 1); and a bulb connected to the base and surrounding the light emitting device (fig 4).

Art Unit: 2879

Horowitz does not disclose a light reflecting plate located on the circuit board around the plurality of light sources of the light emitting repository and having an interior surface inclining outwardly at a predetermined angle and having a predetermined height.

Ishinaga does disclose a light reflecting plate located on the circuit board around the plurality of light sources of the light emitting repository and having an interior surface inclining outwardly at a predetermined angle and having a predetermined height (6 of fig 2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the reflecting plate of Ishinaga into the bulb of Horowitz in order to provide even lighting characteristics.

With regard to claim 7,

Horowitz discloses the light bulb, wherein the plurality of light sources are selected from a group consisting of light-emitting diode, incandescent diode, and small-scale light bulb (110 of fig 1).

With regard to claim 8,

Horowitz discloses the light bulb, wherein the light emitting device is a light selected from a group consisting of a vehicle light, an indoor light, an outdoor light, a street light, and a desk light (paragraph 19).

With regard to claim 9,

Horowitz discloses the light bulb, wherein the bulb has a covering selected from a group consisting of a transparent covering, a fluorescent-coated material covering, and a ground material covering (paragraph 39).

With regard to claim 10,

Horowitz discloses the light bulb.

Horowitz does not disclose the interior surface.

Ishinaga does disclose a cross section of an interior surface to be two diverging straight lines (6x of fig 2).

Utilizing the reasoning in the rejection of claim 6, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the reflecting plate of Ishinaga into the bulb of Horowitz.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher M. Raabe whose telephone number is 571-272-8434. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 7am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on 571-272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CR



ASHOK PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER